

# United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

---

No. 23-1765

NATALIE ANDERSON; ANDRE C. BISASOR,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

PATRICK DONOVAN; NH SUPREME COURT; NH RULES ADVISORY COMMITTEE;  
NH PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE; LORRIE PLATT,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Before

Barron, Chief Judge,  
Gelpí and Rikelman, Circuit Judges.

---

## JUDGMENT

Entered: September 23, 2024

Pro se plaintiffs-appellants Natalie Anderson and Andre C. Bisasor filed a notice of appeal designating the district court's order of dismissal with prejudice, which the district court entered on August 3, 2023, following appellants' failure to file an amended complaint by the deadline set in prior orders. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Prior to dismissal, appellants sought what they called a "final request for an extension of time to file an amended complaint," D.Ct. Dkt. 11 at 1, and the district court granted that request, stating, "Based on the representations of the plaintiff that there shall be no further requests for an extension of time the motion is granted," Endorsed Order, entered on district court docket June 9, 2023. With their extension motion, appellants expressly had requested an extension "of 45 more days . . . until June 30, 2023" to file an amended complaint. D.Ct. Dkt. 11 at 1. With the above-quoted ruling on the motion, the district court did not set a specific updated deadline; however, even construing the district court's June 9 order as extending the deadline to 45 days from entry -- that is, until July 24, 2023 -- appellants missed the deadline to file an amended complaint. Accordingly, on August 3, 2023, 55 days after the district court had granted a 45-day extension, the district court entered its Rule 41(b) order of dismissal with prejudice. D.Ct. Dkt. 12.

After the appeal was opened, this court entered an order to show cause flagging timeliness concerns. See generally Fed. R. App. P. 4(a). Appellants have responded. We assume, without

deciding, that the appeal is properly before the court. See Aponte–Rosario v. Acevedo–Vilá, 617 F.3d 1, 6 (1st Cir. 2010) (discussing bypass of non-Article III issues in favor of affirmance on the merits).

After careful review of the record and of appellants' submissions thus far, we discern no abuse of discretion and affirm the district court's dismissal of the underlying action, substantially for the reasons set forth by the district court in relevant rulings. See Local Rule 27.0(c) (court may dispose of appeal at any time if "no substantial question" is presented); Vivaldi Servicios De Seguridad, Inc. v. Maiso Grp., Corp., 93 F.4th 27, 30-31 (1st Cir. 2024) (standard of review and general principles re dismissals under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)); Tower Ventures, Inc. v. City of Westfield, 296 F.3d 43, 47 (1st Cir. 2002) ("When a litigant seeks an extension of time and proposes a compliance date, the court is entitled to expect that the litigant will meet its self-imposed deadline."). All remaining pending motions, to the extent not mooted by the foregoing, are denied; this includes the pending motion to intervene.

Affirmed.

By the Court:

Maria R. Hamilton, Clerk

cc:

Natalie Anderson  
Andre C. Bisasor  
John M. Formella  
Russell F. Hilliard